

**Mark E. Haddad (SBN 205945), mhaddad@sidley.com**  
**David R. Carpenter (SBN 230299), drcarpenter@sidley.com**  
**SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP**  
**555 West Fifth Street**  
**Los Angeles, California 90013**  
**Telephone: (213) 896-6000**  
**Facsimile: (213) 896-6600**

**Marie L. Fiala (SBN 79676), mfiala@sidley.com  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, California 94104  
Telephone: (415) 772-1200  
Facsimile: (415) 772-7400**

**Jonathan F. Cohn (*pro hac vice* application pending),  
jcohn@sidley.com  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 736.8000  
Facsimile: (202) 736.8711**

## **Attorneys For Defendants Bayer Corporation and Bayer Healthcare LLC**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Pursuant to Local Rule 3-13, counsel of record for Defendants Bayer Corporation and Bayer HealthCare LLC (collectively “Bayer”) hereby gives notice that the above-captioned action involves the same defendants and a material part of the same subject matter as the pending action, *David Johns v. Bayer Corporation and Bayer Healthcare LLC*, No. 09 CV 1935 (S.D. Cal. filed Sept. 3, 2009). *Johns* is a putative nationwide class action brought by an individual consumer asserting claims for violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) and Consumer Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”), as well as for unjust enrichment, based on the alleged false promotion of Bayer’s One a Day® Men’s Health Formula and One a Day® Men’s 50+ Advantage products.

Bayer submits that, at this stage in their proceedings, the current action brought by Plaintiff Center for Science in the Public Interest (“CSPI”) and the *Johns* action raise substantially different issues, such that a transfer or consolidation at this time would not avoid conflicts, conserve resources, or promote an efficient determination of the actions. CSPI is an organization that claims no injury to itself and purports to sue only on behalf of its members. As such, the primary issues raised by CSPI’s Complaint concern “associational standing.” As explained in the concurrently filed Motion to Dismiss, the UCL and CLRA preclude CSPI from invoking the doctrine of “associational standing,” and even if they did not, CSPI’s Complaint fails to allege facts establishing such standing. Those issues are irrelevant to the *Johns* action, which is brought by an individual consumer and which is subject to a pending motion to dismiss for entirely different reasons, relating to the particular allegations of that complaint. In the event both complaints were to survive the respective motions to dismiss, Bayer respectfully suggests that the Court could address the issues contemplated by Local Rule 3-13 in the context of case management proceedings.

Dated: November 20, 2009

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

By: /s/ Mark E. Haddad

*Attorneys for Defendants Bayer Corporation  
and Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc.*